

COMMENTS

The 35 U.S.C. §112 Rejection

The Examiner had rejected claim 1 because there was no antecedent basis for “the speed” and “the voltage”. Claim 1 has been amended to refer to “a speed” and “a voltage” which is believed to resolve this problem.

The Substantive Rejections

The Examiner had indicated that claims 8 and 12-14 included allowable subject matter. Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the language of claim 8, and all remaining claims are dependent from amended claim 1 and are thus believed to be allowable.

Drawings

At paragraph 10 of the Office Action the Examiner made a reference to the drawings originally filed with this case, but that reference was incomplete and made no indication as to whether or not any action is necessary by Applicant regarding the drawings. It is respectfully requested that the Examiner clarify this issue in the next Office Action.



Conclusion

In summary, it is believed that the arguments and amendments set forth above are sound, and accordingly reconsideration of the application is requested along with an early indication of the allowance of claims 1, 3-7 and 9-14.

Respectfully submitted,

Lucian Wayne Beavers
Registration No. 28,183
WADDEY & PATTERSON
A Professional Corporation
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT
Customer No. 23456

Please address all correspondence in this matter to:

Lucian Wayne Beavers
Waddey & Patterson
414 Union Street, Suite 2020
Bank of America Plaza
Nashville, TN 37219
(615) 242-2400

CERTIFICATE OF FIRST CLASS MAILING

I hereby certify that this Amendment, Request for Extension of Time and check for \$510.00 are being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to:

Mail Stop AF
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

on 12-10-04.

Claire Ulanoff

12-10-04

Date